



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

this treaty." Mr. Olney on the American side, has likewise shown the same lofty spirit, the same earnest desire to do what the occasion demanded, the same willingness to make every proper concession in the interests of what was right and just. We doubt if the whole history of American statesmanship contains the record of a man who has entered more quickly, thoroughly and sympathetically into the meaning of a great movement of progress, or has more ably and sagaciously represented the country in a great negotiation. He came to the State Department with little experience in the kind of affairs with which he has there had to deal, in fact, with an immediate previous training at the bar which did not peculiarly fit him for many of his new duties, especially that of peacemaker in international affairs. But such he has proved to be, and notwithstanding mistakes which he may have made, the whole country owes him large gratitude for the sagacity and courage with which he has performed the unusually perplexing and delicate duties of the great office.

The treaty now under consideration in the Senate will always be known as the Olney-Pauncefote treaty. Let them wear together now and hereafter the honors which they have justly won. Greater to them, however, than any external distinction will be the inexpressible satisfaction of having been permitted to perform a service of the very highest order in the promotion of human brotherhood and human happiness.

THE TREATY IN THE SENATE.

The arbitration treaty signed on the 11th ult. was sent immediately to the Senate, where it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs without reading. At this writing it is still in the hands of the Committee, where it has had more or less serious discussion in several meetings. As the Senate is a part of the treaty-making power it is clearly its right and its duty to examine carefully all the provisions of the treaty and to suggest such amendments or modifications as may, under all the circumstances, seem necessary. To this nobody ought to object. However, as this is much the most important "foreign affair" that has come before the Committee on Foreign Affairs for many years, we cannot quite understand why it was not taken up immediately and its examination proceeded with from day to day, or at least at short intervals, until it was finished. The measure is certainly of such extraordinary value as to have justified extraordinary attention.

The impression has widely prevailed, whether truly or falsely, that the Committee and Senators in general did not take the subject at all seriously, until public opinion began to express itself through the papers, and through letters and telegrams, in a most remarkable and unmistakable way.

To the newspaper reports of partizan and factious opposition to the treaty we have not given very great credence. Stray remarks dropped by senators and caught up by sensational reporters and sent out over the country were taken by the public to represent a serious purpose to defeat the treaty outright, or to put off action on it, for partizan reasons, until the next administration should come into power. There was doubtless some truth at the bottom of these reports, enough to justify the public in feeling alarm as to the fate of the treaty. If the attitude of Senators had been favorable, the stray remarks would have indicated it. It is impossible that the whole public, in Washington and beyond it, should have been deceived by absolutely groundless reports.

We are inclined, however, from general indications, to think that the trouble in the Senate was rather that of indifference. Few members of that body, or of the House either, so far as we know, have ever taken more than an academic interest in the subject of arbitration. The cause has had no active leader in Congress, no one to press its importance, as is now done in every European parliament. We have often been surprised at this fact, considering the leading share which our country has had in practical arbitration, *through the action of the Executive Department*. Busied with various national matters of more or less importance, and international matters of another order, Senators had given no very serious attention to the subject of the Anglo-American treaty so long talked of. So that when an actual live peace treaty, full grown, came to them, they scarcely knew what attitude to assume towards it. Some seemed to be afraid of it. Some took it as "a colporteur's dream." The Senate seems to have had very little conception of the profound and wide-spread interest felt in the subject in all parts of the land. The inpouring day after day of the evidences of this interest has been a revelation to them. We do not wonder that they have felt annoyed at it.

It will be a distinct gain to the cause of arbitration treaties, which will soon be poking their heads into the Senate from other countries, to have had the feelings and wishes of the people thus clearly and powerfully expressed. We are not very sorry, therefore, that Senators' "eyes were holden" for the time being. Otherwise we should not have had this overwhelming manifestation of public opinion, such as has not been seen in connection with any great public question for a long time. We do not see why, under all the circumstances, the people should have been criticised, as they have been in open Senate, for flooding the Senators' desks with letters and telegrams, urging ratification. They have the right of petition. It would be better for themselves and the Senate, too, if they exercised it more frequently and more vigorously. It is right that they should have a large confidence in this distinguished body, as they always have

had, but of this confidence there may be too much at times. The people have not had the least intention, as charged by one senator, of interfering with an important diplomatic negotiation while in progress. What they have wanted is that it should "progress" with proper rapidity, and not be killed by indifference or opposition. Nobody has supposed that the treaty could be ratified in "24 hours," though it would be incomparably better to have this hasty action than to have the treaty so changed as to make its rejection by Great Britain certain. If the attitude of senators had not been halting and seemingly unfavorable the public would have kept still. They would have cared little whether the examination of the treaty's provisions took one week or ten.

Now that the Senate and the people understand each other, the treaty is receiving due consideration in Committee, and is likely soon to be reported to the Senate. Whatever opposition there may have been to it at first for narrow, selfish and partizan reasons, seems to have disappeared. The only serious trouble now seems to be in reference to the Monroe Doctrine and the Nicaragua Canal. We have no doubt that whatever difficulties there may be in these directions—and we have not space now to discuss them—will be gotten over in some way and that the Senate will soon give the civilized world the great pleasure of hearing that it has set the seal of its approval to what one of the writers in our symposium calls "one of the greatest papers in human annals."

Since the above was written the Committee on Foreign Affairs has acted on the treaty, and on Monday, Feb. 1st, reported it to the Senate in executive session. The Committee made several changes in the treaty, the two most important of which were that King Oscar of Sweden should not name the umpire in case the tribunal should fail to do so, and that questions of domestic and foreign policy should be expressly excluded from the operation of the compact except by special agreement. These amendments seem to be entirely unnecessary, and the one as to questions of policy seems to some to render the treaty almost valueless. We think, however, that in actual practice this would not prove the case. Much more serious is the actual hostility developed in the Committee to the whole treaty, four members, Morgan, Mills, Daniel and Cameron, having voted not to report it at all. If the opposition in the Senate proves to be proportionally large the treaty must fail. We cannot believe that such will be the case, though, as we write, Morgan and others are doing their worst to prevent ratification. Public sentiment in favor of the treaty continues to accumulate, and we do not comprehend how senators can be so blind as to trifle with a measure of such far-reaching value. If the free silver senators wish to destroy absolutely all confidence in their sincerity and patriotism, they can not accomplish this end more quickly than by trying to defeat this treaty because of their financial dislike of England.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The signing of the Olney-Pauncefote treaty of arbitration on the 11th of January took place in Secretary Olney's office at the State Department at 12.20 o'clock. Sir Julian Pauncefote was accompanied by Viscount Gough, the First Secretary of the British Embassy. Richard Olney had present as the witness for this Government Mr. Thomas W. Creidler, Chief of the Diplomatic Bureau, and Mr. Blandford, his private secretary, to whom the pen with which the document was signed was given as a souvenir. Before signing the two chief actors communicated to each other their "full powers." Sir Julian Pauncefote produced a large sheet of parchment which at great length recited that he was empowered to sign the treaty. The parchment bore the well-known "Victoria R" of the queen. Attached to the credentials by a thick silver and red cord was a silver box. The cover bore a beautifully embossed copy of the royal arms of Great Britain. Inside the box was a wax impression of the great seal of England. Sir Julian handed the parchment and the box over to Mr. Olney, who looked at it with interest. Mr. Olney's credentials were simply a sheet of paper, of the regulation State Department size, on which President Cleveland had written a few words empowering him to sign the treaty. After they had satisfied themselves that their respective credentials were in due form, Secretary Olney sat down at his desk and put his signature at the foot of both copies of the treaty, which had been prepared in duplicate. He then handed the pen to Sir Julian Pauncefote who signed his name in full to both papers. Mr. Olney put a seal opposite his signature and wrote over it the initials "R. O." Sir Julian used as a seal a copy of his family crest. Then the two men shook hands and congratulated each other over what they had accomplished.

On the 17th of January, the first Sabbath after the signing of the Arbitration Treaty, the ministers in many of the pulpits of the country either made allusion to the subject or preached sermons on it. It was characterized by them almost universally as one of the greatest events in the history of Christian civilization. The Christian pulpits of the United States and England during the past year have been the foremost agency, we hesitate not to say, in bringing about that manifestation of public sentiment which made the negotiation and signing of this treaty possible. They turned the Venezuela war craze into a craze for peace. On the Sabbath which followed the scare in December, 1895, they gave the first strong drift to public opinion in favor of lasting friendship between the English speaking peoples. Their influence has again been thrown mightily on the side of truth. In their recent utterance they spoke for the speedy and hearty